DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 675 HE 027 559

AUTHOR McKinnon, Norma Cole
TITLE Evaluating the Evaluators.
PUB DATE Aug 94
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Policy Formation; Program Development
IDENTIFIERS *Atlantic Baptist College NB

ABSTRACT

Atlantic Baptist College (New Brunswick, Canada) developed an evaluation instrument for administrators designed to assess their evaluation work. An ad hoc Staff Evaluation Committee, composed of one senior administrator and individuals (elected by their peers) from across all four institutional departments was responsible for development and adoption of the administrator evaluation instrument. This committee reviewed higher education literature on the subject, solicited evaluation documents from other liberal arts universities, and from these developed a draft instrument which they forwarded to an Administrative Committee for response. Their responses led to revisions for a second draft which was later approved by the Administrative Committee and the Board of Governors. The instrument is attached along with additional information on performance levels. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 675

EVALUATING THE EVALUATORS

by

NORMA COLE MCKINNON, ED.D.
VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

ATLANTIC BAPTIST COLLEGE
MONCTON, N.B. CANADA E1C 9L7

AUGUST, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norma Cole McKinnon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IEU27 559

ABSTRACT

This document addresses the process used to develop an evaluation instrument for administrators at Atlantic Baptist College. The resultant instument is included in its entirety for use by other educators. Finally, the research community is challenged to question present evaluation practises in a more systematic way.

INTRODUCTION

Educators know that public demand for accountability in education in recent years has resulted in the increased systematization of evaluation. Though we hear considerably about the various modes of faculty evaluation, and how administrators can enhance teaching performance by using such techniques as the teaching portfolio, peer review, and clinical supervision, we seldom hear about modes of evaluation for educational administrators. In an age characterized by appeals for accountability, one would infer that concern with administrative evaluation would reign paramount.

As long ago as 1915, Arnold discussed means for increasing school efficiency, including ways to rate principals' performance. Since then, formal evaluation of public school principals has been commonplace (Ginsberg, 1989). Despite the development of modes of evaluation, and despite the fact that principals are key players in education, it is curious that little research has examined principal evaluation in any detail (Duke and Stiggens, 1985; Ginsberg, 1988). Scriven (1967) contends that a pervasive fear exists among human beings of being evaluated. This could be a factor impacting the lack of serious research in the area of principal evaluation.

Ginsberg (1989) notes that "no matter what the reason for the lack of scholarly attention to principal evaluation, there does not seem to be any great impetus to fill the deficiencies which exist in the literature." Just as there are multiple reasons for evaluating principals, there are multiple reasons for

evaluating administrators in higher educational institutions. Despite this confirmed need, the higher education literature is sorely inadequate in the domain of higher education administration evaluation. Essentially, it can be debated that the lack of existing systems and research in the area of administrator evaluation is obstructing any enduring improvement in the personal, professional, and institutional development of administrators, particularly among marginal performers.

The greater scrutiny that higher education administrators are facing today will continue the push to evaluate their performance. Given the apparent shortage of knowledge about higher education administrator evaluation, the problem emerges of how the field should unfold.

First, research on the different evaluation systems or programs should be conducted. Studies in this area should help to determine what evaluation schemes will be suitable for different settings. Unfortunately, much of the current literature that does exist is fundamentally descriptive in nature. The time has come to forecast the functions and outcomes that an evaluation program should serve.

Second, dependent measures to analyze the impact of an administrator evaluation program are needed. This will be a difficult feat, but some measure of quality needs to be devised in order to evaluate the evaluations. There are other areas to be explored as the field evolves; however, probably none is more critical than the development of credible evaluation systems.

At Atlantic Baptist College - a small, private, Christian liberal arts university which grants baccalaureate degrees - a decision was recently made to develop an evaluation program for supervisors and administrators which encouraged personal, professional and institutional growth and development. The purposes of this document are to briefly discuss the process used to develop the resultant evaluation instrument; to provide the instrument in its entirety for use by other educators; to incite the research community to question present evaluation practises in a more systematic way.

Process

An ad hoc Staff Evaluation Committee was established and charged with several responsibilities, including the development, or adoption of, an administrator evaluation instrument. One senior administrator, and individuals from across all four institutional departments, were elected by their peers to serve on the Committee. The Committee met to fulfill its charge over a seven month period, meeting weekly for two or more hours.

It was agreed upon at the outset that an evaluation method specific to the supervisors and senior administrators at the college was needed to properly gauge the performance of these individuals in their complex and diverse tasks. It was also acknowledged that there would be deficiencies in the evaluation instrument and that a new system mandated a carefully thought-out program that would not result in problems for those responsible for the evaluation. Lastly, an assumption was held that the

field of higher education administrator evaluation was in need of systematic examination by educational researchers much more capable than ourselves.

An exhaustive review of the higher education literature, which involved an analysis of approximately fifty sources, revealed that little systematic research has ever been conducted on evaluation of higher education administrators. Typically, there was ample information in the general field of personnel evaluation, but it was agreed that although administrator evaluation shares many characteristics with personnel evaluation, these generic evaluation practises may well impede the growth and development of a sub-field of evaluation specific to educational administrators.

The second procedure used as a foundation for developing an administrator evaluation instrument involved a solicitation of evaluation documents from several liberal arts universities. Naturally, only institutions with analogous missions were contacted. No fewer that five institutions submitted their evaluation systems, in part, or in full. The officials forwarding the information typically gave permission to use information from their documents as judged appropriate by the Committee. The documents were reviewed by the Committee and a rough draft of an instrument for administrator evaluation at Atlantic Baptist College was developed. Most of Trinity Western University's evaluation system was adopted with some alterations.

The first draft of the document was forwarded to the

Administrative Committee for input, minor revisions were suggested, and draft two was generated. Soon thereafter, the document was approved by the Administrative Committee and the Board of Governors. The instrument is presently being used successfully at the college - The expression, **successfully,** is referred to exclusively in the subjective sense. As time passes, additional improvements will be made in the instrument and the appropriate research will be conducted in an attempt to enhance administrator growth across all developmental domains.

References

Arnold, F. (1915). "The unit of supervision, cost and efficiency." School and Society II (27): 1-11.

Duke, D.L. & R.J. Stiggens. (1985). "Evaluating the performance of principals: a descriptive study." Educational Administration Quarterly. 21 (Fall): 71-98.

Ginsberg, R. (1988). "Principal evaluation: policy perspectives." Policy paper prepared for the Southeastern Educational Improvement Laboratory. Columbia, S.C.: South Carolina Educational Policy Center.

Ginsnerg, R. (1989). "Principal evaluation...a call to arms." Administrator's Notebook 33 (7):1-4.

Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In Tyler, R.W., Gagne, R.M. & Scriven, M. (Eds.). Perspectives on Curriculum Evaluation. (A.E.R.A. Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, No. 1) (pp. 29-83). Chicago: Rand McNally.

ATLANTIC BAPTIST COLLEGE
Administrative Staff Evaluation: Policy and Procedure

Policy

Each administrator will receive an annual evaluation of his/her performance. Evaluations will be conducted in the winter semester prior to submission of the budget to the Board of Governors in the spring. The evaluation will be a joint effort between the staff member and his/her immediate supervisor. The primary goals of performance evaluation at Atlantic Baptist College are: personal development, institutional development and salary determination.

Procedure

Atlantic Baptist College's Administration is providing these instructions to assist both parties in the completion of the performance evaluation.

1. All evaluations are to be conducted in a participative atmosphere. The supervisor will sit down with the person being evaluated and cover these basic points as soon as the evaluation materials are received:

   a. Go over the materials that both of you have received, ensuring that the person being evaluated understands that they are to rate themselves on the various traits (using the attached performance level definition sheets), plan their goals and give some thought to their comments.

   b. Set a time that is mutually convenient and will provide 1-2 hours of uninterrupted time.

   c. All ratings, goals and comments should be entered in pencil and converted to pen on one copy during the interview. This will be the final good copy placed in the employee's file.

2. Both parties should collect as much information as possible to allow sound participative decisions to be made on the various ratings, achievement of previous goals and new goals for the next year or review period. Both the supervisor and the employee may have kept information about the previous year's performance. The supervisor should also obtain input from peers and/or from other departments that the person has contact with in the performance of the position responsibilities.

Instructions for Completing Performance Evaluations (continued)

3. The meeting will be a participative process of sharing/communication on the various ratings, arriving at a mutually agreed upon rating for past performance based upon facts, the supervisor's input from others and sharing of future goals. The supervisor's copy would normally be used as the one on which final ratings etc. are entered.

4. Once the ratings and goals have been agreed upon, the employee should be given an opportunity to review the information and to finalize his/her comments. The next day the supervisor and employee should complete the comments and the overall rating for the evaluation, each keeping a photocopy and placing the original in the individual's file.

5. Should there be any reason that this process is not completed within two weeks, the supervisor should advise the employee of the new expected date. In no case should the completion be longer than one month from issue date.

6. All evaluations for administrative staff serving at Atlantic Baptist College will be issued and completed prior to submission of the budget to the Board of Governors in the spring so that accurate salary projections can be made.

7. Evaluators will abide by the "Guidelines For Effective Performance Evaluation Interviews." (see next page)

GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INTERVIEWS

1. Emphasize positive aspects of employee performance.
2. Tell each employee that the evaluation session is to improve performance, not to discipline.
3. Conduct the performance review session in private with minimal interruptions.
4. Review performance formally at least annually and more frequently for new employees or those who are performing poorly.
5. Make criticisms specific, not general and vague.
6. Focus criticisms on performance, not on personality characteristics.
7. Stay calm and do not argue with the person being evaluated.
8. Identify specific actions the employee can take to improve performance.
9. Emphasize the evaluator's willingness to assist the employee's efforts to improve performance.
10. End the evaluating sessions by stressing the positive aspects of the employee's performance.

ATLANTIC BAPTIST COLLEGE

ANNUAL REVIEW

For Administrators/Supervisors

"...that in all things Christ may have the pre-eminence..."
- Colossians 1:18b

DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE LEVELS*

Outstanding *Rating Code 5*	-Administrator/Supervisor consistently far exceeds the College's performance expectations in the subject area. -Exceptionally high quality/quantity performance, consistently contributes beyond his/her share; requires little or no supervision; continuously innovating/improving; highly skilled in selecting, motivating, and developing staff members; unlikely that this level of performance can be exceeded. -Overall this rating applies to Administrators/Supervisors who display the knowledge and performance level of an expert.
Commendable *Rating Code 4*	-Administrator/Supervisor is consistently better than the College's performance expectations in the subject area. -Contributes more than is normally required; superior grasp of own and associated positions; skilled in selecting, motivating, and developing staff members; regularly strives for improvements in areas of responsibility; generally handles well unusual problems/situations. -Overall this rating applies to Administrators/Supervisors who are well seasoned and who consistently adapt and learn quickly in this position.

Standard *Rating Code 3*	-Administrator/Supervisor fully meets the College's performance expectations in the subject area. -Work is completely acceptable; competent performance of all position responsibilities; quality/quantity standards consistently met. -Overall Administrators/Supervisors are expected to be at least standard performers.
Developmental *Rating Code 2*	-Administrator/Supervisor does not yet meet the College's performance expectations in the subject area. -Improvement is required for a Standard level of performance to be reached in the subject area. This may be a new Administrator/Supervisor still learning his/her responsibilities or an Administrator/Supervisor experiencing performance difficulties in the subject area. -This rating, as applied to overall performance, describes someone who is still in the developmental stage and is not necessarily a negative assessment of the person's abilities.
Improvement Required *Rating Code 1*	-Administrator/Supervisor is performing below the College's expectations in subject area. -Administrator/Supervisor's performance in the subject area requires specifically identified improvement within an established length of time (minimum 90 days).
Not Applicable *Rating Code N/A*	Subject area is not applicable to the Administrator/Supervisor and/or position.

*Refer to Appendix A for "Additional Information Defining Performance Levels for Administrators/Supervisors."

ATLANTIC BAPTIST COLLEGE

ANNUAL REVIEW

For Administrators/Supervisors

Name _____ Position _____
Division/Department_____ Date of Review_____
Date of Employment_____
Review Period From_____ To _____

TASK PERFORMANCE*	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of position					
Knowledge of related positions					
Work organization					
Attention to detail					
Response to opportunities that further knowledge and experience					

Explain 1's and 5's _____

PLANNING AND CONTROLLING*	1	2	3	4	5
Recognizes and addresses key issues					
Establishes priorities					
Skill in follow-up					
Expense control					
Meets deadlines					

Explain 1's and 5's _____

*See Guidelines for Reviews for Administrators/Supervisors (attached) for definitions

ATLANTIC BAPTIST COLLEGE

ANNUAL REVIEW
For Administrators/Supervisors

PERSONAL PERFORMANCE*	1	2	3	4	5
Quality and accuracy of own work					
Quality and accuracy of work achieved from staff					
Quantity of own work					
Quantity of work achieved from staff					
Initiative					
Creativity/flexibility					
Stability/perseverance					
Grooming/physical fitness					

Explain 1's and 5's _____

_____

_____

LEADERSHIP*	1	2	3	4	5
Relationship/friendliness with students					
Relationship/friendliness within own department					
Relationship/friendliness with other departments					
Willingness and ability to accept responsibility					
Willingness and ability to make decisions					
Respects confidential information					
Skill in delegating					
Skill in motivating					
Evidences Christian virtue					

Explain 1's and 5's _____

_____

_____

*See Guidelines for Reviews for Administrators/Supervisors (attached) for definitions.

ATLANTIC BAPTIST COLLEGE

ANNUAL REVIEW
For Administrators/Supervisors

COMMUNICATION*	1	2	3	4	5
Communication skills with staff					
Communication skills with peers					
Communication skills with management					

Explain 1's and 5's _____
_____
_____

OVERALL PERFORMANCE (Mathematical average of preceding 30 factors): _____

COMMENTS ON ACHIEVEMENT OF PREVIOUS GOALS

_____
_____
_____
_____

PLANS/GOALS FOR NEXT REVIEW PERIOD
Departmental Plans/Goals
1._____

2._____

3._____

Position Plans/Goals
1._____

2._____

3._____

Personal/Professional Development
1._____

2._____

3._____

***See Guidelines for Reviews for Administrators/Supervisors (attached) for definitions.**

ATLANTIC BAPTIST COLLEGE

ANNUAL REVIEW

For Administrators/Supervisors

INPUT FROM ADMINISTRATOR'S/SUPERVISOR'S EMPLOYEES

ADMINISTRATOR'S/SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS

Administrator's/Supervisor's Signature_____ **Date**_____

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS

Supervisor's Signature_____ **Date**_____

SUPERVISOR'S OVERALL RATING
(To be completed after Administrator's/Supervisor's interview with supervisor)

5	4	3	2	1
Outstanding	Commendable	Standard	Developmental	Improvement Required

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWS

For Administrators/Supervisors

"...that in all things Christ
may have the pre-eminence..."
-Colossians 1:18b

TASK PERFORMANCE

Knowledge of Position: Acquainted with all task requirements of the position.
Knowledge of Related Positions: Acquainted with all task requirements of associated and reporting positions.
Work Organization: Capable of planning and organizing work; punctual; systematic.
Alertness to Detail: An understanding for, and completion of, all minor points and technicalities of each task.
Response to Opportunities that Further Knowledge and Experience: Recognizing, grasping, and using those opportunities to make improvements personally and in functional operations associated with the position.

PLANNING AND CONTROLLING

Recognizes and Addresses Key Issues: Is aware of, and applies himself/herself to, current and new issues as they arise.
Establishes Priorities: Shows flexibility and dedication in planning tasks to be completed.
Skill in Follow-Up: Demonstrates continuing awareness of ongoing programs. Assigns tasks using knowledge of skills available.
Expense Control: Discusses, plans, presents, implements, and maintains control of departmental yearly budget.
Meets Deadlines: Is on time or early on specifically set task deadlines.

PERSONAL PERFORMANCE

Quality and Accuracy of Own Work: Completeness, neatness, thoroughness, and accuracy of own work.
Quality and Accuracy of Work Achieved From Staff: Completeness, neatness, thoroughness, and accuracy of work done by reporting staff.
Quantity of Own Work: Volume, speed, own work kept up to date.
Quantity of Work Achieved From Staff: Volume, speed, and work of reporting staff kept up to date.
Initiative: Has suggested improvements for doing his/her job, requires a minimum of instruction for ordinary work assignments, self-reliant, resourceful. Takes initiative to effect change without being asked.
Creativity/flexibility: Talent for developing new ideas, for finding new and better ways of doing things, for being imaginative. Showing flexibility in application and implementation of ideas.
Stability/Perseverance: The ability to withstand pressure and to remain calm in crisis situations. Stick-to-it-iveness.
Grooming/Physical Fitness: Observes personal hygiene standards and dresses to fit the job; physically alert, energetic.

LEADERSHIP

Relationship/Friendliness with Students: Friendly, effective ability to work with and supervise students.
Relationship/Friendliness with Own Department: Ability to get along with others, willingness to share in unpleasant aspects of job.
Relationship/Friendliness with Other Departments: Ability to deal with College and community in a friendly, effective manner.
Willingness and Ability to Accept Responsibility: Has a burden for his/her department; holds himself/herself accountable for all department and position responsibilities.
Willingness and Ability to Make Decisions: Does research and initiates sound decisions in an easy to follow manner.
Respects Confidentiality of Information: Ability to keep confidential information in orderly, safe fashion. Effectiveness in keeping confidences.
Skills in Delegating: Skill displayed in delegating responsibilities in relation to staff members' skills.
Skills in Motivating: Skill displayed in providing incentive to staff members.
Evidences Christian Virtue: Evidences a personal relationship with Christ and reflects wholesome Christian attitudes.

COMMUNICATION

Communication Skills with Staff; Displays positive verbal and written skills in both easy and difficult situations; supports staff in all circumstances.
Communication Skills with Peers: Displays positive verbal and written skills in both easy and difficult situations; supports peers in all circumstances.
Communication with Management: Displays positive verbal and written skills in both easy and difficult situations; supports management in all circumstances.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

Overall average of all items rated.

Appendix A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION DEFINING PERFORMANCE LEVELS for Administrators/Supervisors

PERFORMANCE LEVEL - *OUTSTANDING* (Rating Code 5)

This level is used for trait ratings and overall performance for those whose performance is consistently excellent and far exceeds the College's expectations of what is required in the trait or position.

EXAMPLES

1. An Administrator/Supervisor who displays exceptionally high quality/quantity performance, consistently contributes beyond his/her share; requires little or no supervision; continuously innovating/improving; highly skilled in selecting, motivating and developing staff members; unlikely that this level of performance can be exceeded in the trait or position.

2. An Administrator/Supervisor who has complete knowledge of the trait or position gained through extensive experience.

3. An Administrator/Supervisor who shows great understanding of far more than their position.

4. An Administrator/Supervisor who uses their vast knowledge of the trait or position and the College to achieve optimum results, both in quality and quantity.

PERFORMANCE LEVEL - *COMMENDABLE* (Rating Code 4)

This level is used for trait ratings and overall performance for those who performance is consistently better than expected and usually at a very high level. Unusual proficiency and adaptability is shown in most situations.

EXAMPLES

1. An Administrator/Supervisor who consistently accomplishes more than expected or is normally required in the trait or position. One who has a superior grasp of their own and associated positions; is skilled in selecting, motivating and developing staff members and regularly strives for improvements in areas of responsibility. Also can assume extra projects without affecting normal work responsibility.

2. An Administrator/Supervisor who makes sound decisions, generally handles unusual problems/situations well; produces better than targeted results and who requires little or no supervision or follow up in the trait or position.

3. An Administrator/Supervisor who takes initiative, plans ahead and is "pro-active" in the performance of the trait or position responsibilities.

4. An Administrator/Supervisor who has a broad management view of the trait or position and works toward achieving results for the College/department - not just their area of responsibility.

PERFORMANCE LEVEL - *STANDARD* (Rating Code 3)

This level is used for traits and overall performance for those whose performance is fully satisfactory in **all** respects and meets the standards expected.

EXAMPLES

1. An Administrator/Supervisor whose work is completely acceptable; competent performance of all position responsibilities; quality/quantity standards consistently met with few mistakes and does not repeat them in the trait or position.

2. An Administrator/Supervisor who sets priorities properly, is well organized and requires only normal supervision and follow up in the trait or position.

3. An Administrator/Supervisor who completes their projects and assignments in the trait or position almost always on schedule.

4. An Administrator/Supervisor who displays complete knowledge of the trait, position and related activities.

PERFORMANCE LEVEL - *DEVELOPMENTAL* (Rating Code 2)

This level is used for traits and overall performance for those whose performance is reasonably acceptable in some areas but not in all. This may be a person new to the position or one who is experiencing performance difficulties. There is room for improvement in the trait or overall performance in order to meet the normal standard for the position.

EXAMPLES

1. An Administrator/Supervisor who needs considerable follow-up to see that trait or position responsibilities are done.

2. An Administrator/Supervisor who has the ability, is not using it and is experiencing performance difficulties in the trait or position.

3. An Administrator/Supervisor who has not been in the position long enough to know how to satisfactorily perform the trait or cope with the job situation.

PERFORMANCE LEVEL - *IMPROVEMENT REQUIRED* (Rating Code 1)

This level is used for traits and overall performance for those whose performance is clearly below the standard expected. Specifically identified improvement is required within 90 days.

EXAMPLES

1. An Administrator/Supervisor who does not display the drive or know-how to do the trait or position.

2. An Administrator/Supervisor who may be creating a morale problem within the College or department.

3. An Administrator/Supervisor who does not grasp the trait, position or situation and who cannot get things accomplished.

4. An Administrator/Supervisor who makes frequent mistakes, requires constant follow up and displays poor judgement in the trait or position.

Program based on Trinity Western University's model, 1993.